

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on March 4, 2009, has been received, and carefully considered.

Preliminarily, it should be noted that claim 1 has been amended to recite a method for producing a molded piece in which a circumferential web is formed to connect the molded piece to the mold blank. Also, claim 12 has been amended to recite a method for producing a molded piece in which a perforated circumferential membrane is formed to connect the molded piece to the mold blank.

The rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner considers that the term "circumferential web" has no conventional meaning in the art and that it is unclear to the Examiner (i) if the circumferential web is structurally different to that of the "stimulus" which is mentioned in the prior art, and (ii) if the circumferential web must have multiple connection points that form around the periphery of the molded piece in connection with the mold blank.

It is submitted by the Applicants that the term "circumferential web" is clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art reading Applicants' specification disclosure. The Applicants are permitted to be their own lexicographers, and

the specification clearly discusses the relationship between the mold blank, circumferential web, and the molded piece such that no doubt will remain as to the structure and function of the circumferential web. In the original application documents, the web has been referred to as a "stimulus". The translator used the term "stimulus" for the German word "Anstiftung", meaning to express the connection between mold blank and the molded piece. As stated in the response filed on December 2, 2008, the Applicants consider that a more accurate translation for element 32 described in the application is "circumferential web".

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is obviated by appropriate amendment.

The rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is obviated by appropriate amendment.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully urge favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-10, 13, and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA) in view of Filser (U.S. 7,077,391, hereinafter "Filser (US'391)"). Furthermore, claim 11 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable

over APA in view of Filser (US'391), and further in view of Bodenmiller et al. (US 6,495,073).

The Applicants respectfully maintain that the cited prior art does not disclose or suggest Applicants' invention, as presently claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Fig. 1 of the present application and Filser (US'391) disclose the identical state of the art that was used prior to the invention for bringing out from a blank a coping (cap) or a bridgework by means of shape cutting, especially milling and grinding (page 2, second paragraph, of the specification):

"A corresponding manufacturing process contains a stimulus of the casting to be machine cut and, thereafter, milled and sharpened mostly on its outer sides, whereby, with dental objects, a buccal or lingual stimulus seldom occurs proximal. During the working, the casting is maintained by the stimulus in order to be roughly separated and manually worked, that the wall thickness in the ranges concerned exhibit something of the remaining casting, thus with a dental object exhibiting a cap or bridgework. Concerning soft materials, the reworking is connected with a substantial risk of destruction, whereas with hard materials, a higher time and tool expenditure is needed. Moreover, there is the risk that the wall thickness falls below its recommended limit during the reworking."

Thus, the coping or bridgework to be produced has a relatively large cross section and, as a consequence, after breaking the web, it is necessary to refinish the workpiece.

This can be seen in Fig. 1 of the present application since the web 20 is represented with a relatively large cross section.

Due to the size of the web or stud-like connection, refinishing is required. The disadvantages resulting from this have been described on page 8, first paragraph, of the specification.

As is clear, the state of the art in form of WO-A-2002/45614 corresponds to US 7,077,391. This is also confirmed by column 5, lines 45-47:

"On completion of machining of the blank, the webs 20 are separated front the workpiece 18 and the point of separation of the workpiece is ground smooth.

The present invention detaches from this technique since it is provided that the molded piece is completely processed inside and outside, whereby the molded piece remains connected with the blank via a circumferential thin web which is separated at the end.

Due to the fact that the molded piece remains connected with the mold blank via a circumferential web, the circumferential web can consequently be very thin, and this is made also clear by a comparison between Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application. As a result, separation of the molded piece from the mold blank can be carried out such that the

outer geometry of the molded piece can be produced directly so that after separation of the circumferential web, a further refinishing of the piece is not necessary.

Since the state of the art always suggests that the connection between mold blank and workpiece is achieved by means of a web with a relatively large cross section which requires finishing after the piece is separated from the blank, the prior art cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

The Bodenmiller et al. reference does not fill the gaps left by Filser (US'391).

Consequently, a combination of the prior art cited by the Examiner does not make obvious Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 1-11, 13, and 17-19.

In order to make clearly evident the differences between the state of the art and the invention the Examiner's attention is directed to the enclosed diagrams showing the differences between the present invention and the prior art.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are unsustainable, and urge favorable reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

It is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early allowance to this effect

is respectfully urged. If any final points remain that can be clarified by telephone, Examiner Abraham is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Malcolm J. MacDonald".

Date: June 4, 2009

Malcolm J. MacDonald
Reg. No. 40,250
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 24